REMARKS

Applicant is in receipt of the Office Action mailed May 10, 2007. Claims 8-14 have been amended. Therefore, claims 1-21 are pending in this case. Reconsideration of the present case is earnestly requested in light of the following remarks.

101 Rejection

Claims 8-14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicant has amended claim 8 to recite "A computer accessible memory medium" instead of "A carrier medium" to overcome this issue. Applicant has similarly amended claims 9-14. Removal of the 101 rejection is therefore requested.

102 Rejection

Claims 1-3, 7-10, 14-17, and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Lowry et al. ("Lowry", US Patent No. 6,772,206).

Regarding claim 1, Lowry fails to disclose **translating the instructions for performing the task from the portable format to an executable format at the one or more remote computer systems, thereby generating executable instructions for performing the plurality of subtasks**, and **executing the executable instructions to perform the subtasks comprising the task**. With respect to this limitation, the Office Action relies on column 9, and the first four paragraphs of column 10. In particular, the Office Action notes:

> The system disclosed by Lowry employs an adapter that converts a request, using HTTP protocol, into another ATP protocol based format. The intermediate uses XML, and this is considered to by the portable format. [*Sic*]

Applicant agrees that Lowry describes one or more adapters which are used to facilitate communication between applications by conversion of requests and responses from HTTP to XML to ATP and vice versa. However, there is no description indicating that these messages include instructions which are translated to an executable format and executing the resulting executable instructions. Instead, the adaptors merely

communicate requests and responses which are not disclosed as including instructions which are translatable into executable instructions. Applicant notes that the Office Action (in a previous limitation of the claim) asserts "The APIs calls contain the instructions [*Sic*]"; however, there is no description in the cited sections or anywhere else that support this assertion. As one skilled in the art understands, and as disclosed in Lowry, the API calls refer to function calls of an application; in other words, the API calls invoke execution of functions of applications (See column 3, line 5-column 4, line 6). One skilled in the art would understand that API calls are not instructions which are translatable to executable instructions for execution as required by claim 1.

103 Rejections

Claims 4, 6, 11, 13, 18, and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lowry in view of Tso et al. ("Tso", US Patent No. 6,247,050).

Claims 5, 12, and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lowry in view of Chen et al. ("Chen", US Patent No. 5,831,975).

Regarding the 102 and 103 Rejections, Applicant submits that numerous ones of the dependent claims recite further distinctions over the cited art. However, since the rejection has been shown to be unsupported for the independent claims, a further discussion of the dependent claims is not necessary at this time.

CONCLUSION

Applicant submits the application is in condition for allowance, and an early notice to that effect is requested.

If any extensions of time (under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136) are necessary to prevent the above-referenced application(s) from becoming abandoned, Applicant(s) hereby petition for such extensions. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees which may be required or credit any overpayment to Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert & Goetzel P.C., Deposit Account No. 50-1505/5602-11600/JCH.

Respectfully submitted,

/Jeffrey C. Hood/
Jeffrey C. Hood, Reg. #35198
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT(S)

Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert & Goetzel PC
P.O. Box 398
Austin, TX 78767-0398
Phone: (512) 853-8800
Date: June 25, 2007 JCH/JLS